

NOV 24 2005

Appn. No. 10/782,115
Amendment dated November 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, and 4 through 12 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 13 through 22 have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

The specification has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The specification has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph) as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

The objection to the requirement of claim 10 that "said handle member includes a bore extending therethrough for receiving said medial portion" appears to be based upon the belief that the handle member could not be fitted onto the medial portion of the wrench without destroying the head of the wrench, since the head of the wrench is larger than the size of the bore in the handle member. However, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize a number of ways of positioning the handle member

Appln. No. 10/782,115
Amendment dated November 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005

on the medial portion without destroying the head of the wrench, such as, for example, forming the handle member in two clamshell portions that are attached together about the medial portion, which would not require that the head of the wrench pass through the bore. Also, the handle member could be formed directly on the medial portion without necessarily restricting the movement of the handle member on the medial portion.

Therefore, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the disclosure of the application, would understand that there are a number of ways that the medial portion of the wrench could be located in the bore of the handle member without destroying the head of the wrench.

Withdrawal of the §112 (first paragraph) rejection of claims _ through _ is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 4 through 7 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, and 6 through 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Catanese.

Claims 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Catanese in view of LaPodura.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claims 2 and 3, which was indicated as being allowable over the prior art, and therefore claim 1, as well as the claims that depend from claim 1, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 6 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Appl. No. 10/782,115
Amendment dated November 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005


NOV 24 2005

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Nov. 24, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357